DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 652 FL 001 782

AUTHOR Restan, Per A.
TITLE The Objective Case in Negative Clauses in Russian: The Genitive or the Accusative?
PUB DATE 60
NOTE 21p.
JOURNAL CIT Scando-Slavica; v6 p92-112 1960

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Case (Grammar), Diachronic Linguistics, Distinctive Features, Form Classes (Languages), Grammar, *Language Research, Linguistic Patterns, Linguistics, Morphemes, *Negative Forms (Language), *Russian, Slavic Languages, Structural Linguistics, *Synchronic Linguistics

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to give a description of the linguistic position of the negative genitive in written Russian and to explain the relationship between different factors. It is demonstrated that the negative genitive still holds its position as the stronger case in negative clauses with 69 percent of all sample cases in the genitive, as compared with 31 percent in the accusative case. However, it is noted that the accusative case is becoming more widely used in newspapers and in belles-lettres. Frequent statistical data with linguistic examples support the research and concluding remarks. (RL)

ED049652

From: Scando-Slavica · Tomus VI, 1960.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PER A. RESTAN:

The Objective Case in Negative Clauses in Russian The Genitive or the Accusative?*

Grammatika ne predpisyvajet zakonov jazyku,
no iz'jasn'ajet i utverždajet jego obyčai.

A. S. Puškin

In his examination of *genitivus negationis* in Church Slavonic, *Střídání záporového genitivu se záporovým akusativem v staroslověnštině*, Radoslav Večerka gives an excellent introduction to the problem of *genitivus negationis* not only in Church Slavonic but also in Russian and the other Slavonic languages. He discusses the origin of this type of genitive, and deals with the relationships between the negative objective genitive and the negative subjective genitive. He states that the genitive after a negation was the compulsory, usual case in the youngest period of the preslavonic language – a case without any particular syntactic or stylistic qualities. On the other hand it was not a case that was used without exceptions. Most probably the accusative, too, could be made use of, but only as an extraordinary, rare means of expression, in some way or other linguistically motivated. Later we find examples of a similar usage in Church Slavonic, Old Czech and perhaps other Old Slavonic languages (Polish? Russian?). In historical times this usage has mainly been preserved in Russian and Polish whereas the negated objective genitive otherwise in the Slavonic language territory has to varying degrees been supplanted by the accusative, concludes Večerka.

Russian

What about this grammatical phenomenon in modern Russian?

Already thirty years ago professor Leontij Kopeckij (*Ruská skladba pro Čechy*, Praha 1929) stated: "... we can no longer say that the negated genitive is the rule in Russian. In that case almost half of the instances would have to be considered exceptions to the rule." And fifteen years before that, in 1914, Peškovskij (page 297, see Bibliography) wrote that the negated acc. in our day is "*soveršenno obyčen*". Ovs'aniko-Kulikovskij (*Učebnik*... 101) finds, however, that the gen. should be preferred, and

* Bibliography indicated at the end of this article.

FL 001 782

Paffen (101–02) that the gen. would often have been "*richtiger und natürlicher*". Ekblom (142) declares that examples of the acc. nevertheless "are frequent", Holger Pedersen (124) maintains that the negated object "not infrequently" is put in the acc., and Marnitz (157) states that exceptions to the gen. rule "are not rare".

The normative grammar of the USSR Science Academy (*Gramm. russk. jaz.* II, č. 1, 562–63) formulates a point of view that is as radical as that of Kopeckij and Peškovskij. It abandons completely the rule of *genitivus negationis* and states solely that the negated object "usually" is put in the gen. "*kogda dopolnenije oboznačajet objekt vosprijatija, mysli, ožidanija, želanija...*" In other cases, declares the grammar, both the acc. and the gen. are possible.

This confusion of partly contradictory statements reveals that the problem of the negated gen. and the negated acc. is rather complex. We have considered it our main objective to find a more precise formulation of genitive and accusative frequency. For that purpose we have collected 2119 examples of objects in negative clauses, all of them from the period 1918–1959*. The examples are taken from two sources, belles-lettres and newspapers. Each of these two main groups are again divided into two subdivisions. Thus we get four categories of approximately the same size:

1) narrative prose, 588 examples
2) dialogue, 520 examples
3) *Izvestija* 1918–23, 507 examples
4) *Izvestija* 1959, 504 examples

The *belles-lettres* includes the following authors and books (place and year refer to the issue used by us):

M. Gor'kij,	*Moi universitety*, Moskva 1953
M. Zoščenko,	*Nervnyje l'udi*, Pariž 1927
	Rasskazy i fel'jetony, Moskva 1958
M. Šoloxov,	*Tixij Don*, kn.I. č. 1, Moskva 1947
A. Kornejčuk,	*Gibel' eskadry*, P'jesy, Moskva-Leningrad 1948
V. Katajev,	*Kvadratura kruga*, P'jesy, Moskva 1955
	Doroga cvetov, P'jesy, Moskva 1955
	Otčij dom, Moskva 1945
	Syn polka, Moskva 1945
L. Leonov,	*Obyknovennyj čelovek* (*Sobr. soč.*, t. III, Moskva 1953)

* This article is a summary of my dissertation for the M.A. degree, University of Oslo, 1959: *Konkurransen mellom nektet genitiv og nektet akkusativ i moderne russisk (1918–1959)*, 169 pages, illustrated. Available at the University Library, Oslo.

Lenuška (*Izbrannoje*, Moskva 1945)
Našestvije (*Izbrannoje*, Moskva 1945)
K. Paustovskij, *Zolotaja roza*, Moskva 1956
A. Tolstoj, *P'otr pervyj*, kn. I, gl. 1–3, Moskva 1946
K. Simonov, *Dni i noči*, Moskva 1946
Russkij vopros (*Soc.*, t. II, Moskva 1952)
I. Erenburg, *Ottepel'*, č. 1, Moskva 1956

The *newspaper* group includes only the *Izvestija*, but from two different periods:

a) the *Izvestija* 1918–23
1918: January 6 and 30, July 17, 18, 19 and 20
1920: March 24, 28 and 30
1923: May 10, 11 and 15, June 5

b) the *Izvestija* 1959
January 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 28, 29, 30, 31
April 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23

When gathering our material we excluded the following categories:

1) *genus animatum*: in the singular all masculin nouns (apart from the *a*-stems), in the plural all genders
2) *kto* (*kogo*), personal and reflexive pronouns
3) *ničto* (*ničego*). One example is included as a curiosity, see below, under "Inversion",
4) the objects of verbs like *xotet'*, *ždat'* etc., i.e. verbs that sometimes take the gen. even in positive clauses,
5) objects in negative clauses where the negation is not attached to the predicate, but to another word (*ne vse znali eto*).

By totalling the examples it turns out that *in our material accusative frequency for objects in negative clauses is 31 per cent* (657 acc. as against 1462 gen.).

Below we give a detailed analysis of the examples.

Indirect Negation

It has been asserted that the accusative tendency increases when the predicate of the object is an infinitive that is governed by a negated finite auxiliary verb or a negated verbal expression.[1] – We have arrived at the same conclusion in our research. In the material examined by us accusative frequency is *60,1 per cent* (321 acc., 213 gen.). The corresponding figures for objects

[1] Cf. Šaxmatov I 324; Magner 540; Gvozd'ov 154–55; Peškovskij 297; *Gramm. russk. jaz.* II, 1, 562; Ovs.-Kulik. *Ruk.* 194; Deribas 25; Pedersen 124; Restan 30–40.

directly governed by negated finite verbs are 21,2 per cent (336 acc., 1249 gen.).

...voobšče ne mogu videt' *gibel'* celoveka na ulice (Zošč. *Nervn. l'udi* 44),
Ja *etogo pis'ma* pročest' ne mogu! (Zošč. *Rassk...* 52).

Nel'z'a že direktoru zavoda ustraivat' *romany* (Erenb. *Ottepel'* 109),
Vnutri Rossii *graždanskoj vojny* bol'se razžeč' nel'z'a (*Izv.* 15.5.23. Lunačarskij).

Buržuaznye politiki ne v silax pon'at' *patriotizm i trudovoj entuziazm* sovetskix l'udej (*Izv.* 28.1.59. Xruščov),
...ne v silax otvesti *sijajuščix glaz* ot svojego kapitana (Kat., *Syn polka* 148).

...Sojedin'onnyje Štaty ne mogut prin'at' *uslovij* predloženija Moskvy, a takže *bol'šinstvo* položenij, kotoryje... soderžats'a v russkom projekte (the acc. and the gen. in the same clause. – *Izv.* 17.1.59).

Nouns Ending in -a, -ja

Numerous linguists assert that accusative frequency increases when the object in the negative clause is a singular noun belonging to the *a*-stems.[2] – This is in accordance with the results of our investigation, as the *a*-nouns in our collection display an accusative frequency of *47,6 per cent* (199 acc., 219 gen.). The corresponding figures for the remaining singular nouns is 24,9 per cent (249 acc., 714 gen.).

...10 rub.sutočnyx, ne sčitaja *kvartiru* i prodovol'stvije (*Izv.* 6.1.18),
...ni odna iz storon ne ustupila by drugoj kakuju-libo *territoriju* ili naselenie (*Izv.* 11.4.59),
Nevozmožno zabyt' platana Gippokrata, jego Asklepija, jego teatra, nakonec, vyrazitel'nuju jego *figuru*, vysečennuju iz glyby m'ortvogo kamn'a (cf. the gen. *platana, teatra* in the same clause. – *Izv.* 15.1.59, Vinogradov, Prof. of Med.).

...no on ne vypuskal *granaty*, derža jejo takim obrazom, čtoby metnut' v pervoje že opasnoje mgnovenije (Sim. *Dni i noči*, 191),
Ja, pravda, *knižki* ne čital (a particular book just mentioned! Erenb. *Ottepel'* 22),
...svojej novoj *kvartiry* v mnogoetažnom zdanii ne ukrašajem možževelovymi vetkami (*Izv.* 1.1.59),

[2] Cf. Magner 535; Uglitsky 380–81; Deribas 23; Dobromyslov 217–19; Tomson, *Vin.* p. 660–62; Restan 41–48.

...ne možet ne vyzyvat' *trevogi* i *ozabočennosti* u vsex tex, kto... (*Izv.* 30.1.59).

Concrete, Definite Nouns

Most linguists assert that acc. frequency increases when the object in the negative clause is a concrete, definite noun.[3] – We have arrived at the same conclusion. Acc. frequency is *55,6* per cent (217 acc., 173 gen.) for concrete, definite nouns. The remaining nouns show the following distribution: 25,5 per cent (377 acc., 1103 gen.).

a) *Nouns denoting persons*

Šuročka ne uznala *babušku* (Erenb. *Ottepel'* 105),
...ne povidav *dočeri* (Paust. *Zol. roza* 77).

b) *Collective nouns*

Odnako eti kozni ne ostanovili irakskij *narod* (*Izv.* 30.1.59),
No ni oslepit', ni oduračit', ni razstrel'at' iz puški "Kollosal'" (sic!) vsego *naroda* buržuazija ne možet! (*Izv.* 17.7.18).

c) *Parts of the human body*

I ja vas ješčo pocelovala, no vy uže ne otkryvali bol'še *glaza* (Sim. *Dni i noči* 129),

...ne mog otorvat' ot nejo *glaz* (Erenb. *Ottepel'* 56).

...on ne prot'agival drožaščuju *ruku* (Paust. *Zol. roza* 202),

Prostite, ne mogu podat' vam *ruki* (Leon. *Našestvije* 501).

Šerst'anye čulki, a ne grejut moi *nožen'ki* (Šol. *Tich. Don* 88),
...kotoryje ne umeli *nog* sognut' po-nastojaščemu (Šol. *Tix. Don* 103).

d) *Clothes*

Ne snimaja *furažku* (Gor'kij, *Moi univ.* 115),
...ne skinuv *furažki* (Šol., *Tix. Don* 63).

...ne sn'ala s golovy *platok* (Erenb. *Ottepel'* 35),
Platka u nego tože ne našli (Zošč. *Nervn. l'udi* 15).

e) *Other commonplace words denoting concrete things*

...tak i ne našol *dom* Bloka (Paust. *Zol. roza* 182),
...ne otdadim *doma*, a, komissar? (*gen.sing.*, Sim. *Dni i noči* 66),
A my ne otdadim eto *mesto* (Sim. *Dni i noči* 212).

[3] Cf. Tomson, *Vin. p.*; *K sintaksisu*; *Beiträge*; Kout 446–47, 18–19; *Gramm. russk. jaz.* II, 1, 562; Gvozd'ov 154; Dobromyslov 217–19; Ekblom 142; Ughtsky 380–83; Magner 538–39; Deribas 22; Restan 49–64.

Net, *školu* ona sredi goda ne brosit (Erenb. *Ottep.* 82),
...*školy* Lena ne brosit (Erenb. *Ottep.* 61).

f) *Proper nouns*
In our selection accusative frequency for this subdivision of concrete, definite nouns is as much as *76,7 per cent* (33 acc., 10 gen.).

...ne ponimaju ja *Son'u* (Erenb. *Ottepel'* 31),
On ne videl *Soni* (Erenb. *Ottepel'* 31).

...ne otpuskaja *Aleksašku* (Tolst. *P'otr I* 52),
...ne iskl'učaja i *Filippin* (*Izv.* 19.7.18).

...ja ne mogu predstavit' sebe *Rossiju* bez Volgi (Paust. *Zol. roza* 186),
A ješčo nedavno nel'z'a bylo predstavit' sebe *Nevy* bez barž s drovami, a *Moskvy* – bez ešelonov s dorogim doneckim ugl'om (*Izv.* 1.1.59).

The Question of Number

Tomson and Magner declare that accusative frequency is very low when the object in the negative clause is a plural noun. – This does not agree with the results we have arrived at in our research.[4] According to our material the plural and singular nouns do not seem to differ very much as to accusative frequency. In the plur. acc. frequency is *29,9 per cent* (146 acc., 343 gen.) as against 32,4 per cent in the sing. (448 acc., 933 gen.).
...grafa Tolstogo *sočinenij* ne slučalos' čityvat'? (Gor'kij, *Moi univ. 52*),
[l'udi], kotoryje ne mogut udovletvorit' *samyx elementarnyx svoix potrebnostej* (*Izv.* 28.1.59, Xruščov).

Ja...pr'amo ne pojmu vaši *obidy* (Zošč. *Rasskazy*...80),
My sliškom liberal'ny k l'ud'am, ne uvažajuščim naši *normy* povedenija (*Izv.* 18.1.59).

The Question of Aspect

Some linguists state that accusative frequency is promoted if the predicate of the object has a perfective aspect.[5] – The results of our research seem to support this statement. In our selection acc. frequency for perf. predicates is *40,1 per cent* (344 acc., 515 gen.) as against 25 per cent for imperfective pred. (306 acc., 918 gen.).

[4] Cf. Tomson, *Vin. p.* 695–96; *Beiträge* 255; Magner 537; Restan 65–71.
[5] Cf. Tomson, *Vin. p.* 678, *Beiträge* 253–54; Magner 535, Karcevski 100; Šapiro 196; Černyšov, *Otric.* 61–63; Restan 62–76.

Ona byla ne v silax sderžat' *rydanija* (Paust. *Zol. roza* 10),
Nikto ne mog vynesti jego *natiska* (Paust. *Zol.roza* 203).

...oni ne vveli v boj krupnyje *sily* noč'ju (Sim. *Dni i noči* 207),
...my ne narušim etot *mir* (*Izv.* 18.7.18, Zinovjev).

Imperative Clauses

It has been maintained that accusative frequency increases when the negated predicate expresses a demand, i.e. has an imperative mode. Our investigation has given the same result.[6] By excluding certain cliches like *ne obraščaj vnimanija* (always the gen.), *ne moroč' golovu* (always the acc.) we have limited our selection to 41 examples. Out of this number 22 display the acc., i.e. *53,7 per cent*.

Ne progloti *igolku* (Leon. *Obyk.čel.* 545),
Ne omračaj mne *prazdnika* (Leon. *Našestvije* 504).

Ty mne *eto* ne govori (Sim. *Dni i noči* 113),
Tol'ko vy nikomu *etogo* ne peredavajte (Paust. *Zol.roza* 34).

Nikogda tak ne stav'te *tufli* (Paust. *Zol.roza* 60),
Černil ne oprokin'te (Leon. *Našestvije* 480).

Interrogative Clauses

Tomson states that the accusative tendency asserts itself strongly in negative interrogative clauses. In our investigation we have arrived at the same result.[7] Acc. frequency is *70,4 per cent* (38 acc., 16 gen.). It is, however, probable that acc. frequency is still higher than 70,4 per cent for those negative questions to which the interrogator expects positive answers, for instance *Ne razbudit' li baryn'u* (Gonč.), or negative questions that involve hesitation, doubt etc., for instance *A ne zabrosit' li kuda topor* (Dost.).

A počemu ne sozdat' roditel'skije *komitety* ili detskije *komissii* (*Izv.* 18.1.59),
A ne rub'at li životnovody oblasti tot *suk*, na kotorom sid'at (*Izv.* 11.1.59),
...ne prinesli li *gazetu* (Erenb. *Ottepel'*).

Nu kak ne sn'at' *šapki* i ne poklonit's'a do zemli (*Izv.* 14.1.59),
Neuželi pones'onnyja nami s tex por žertvy ne zaslužili *ulybki* istorii (*Izv.* 17.7.18).

[6] Cf. Tomson, *Vin. p.* 680–83, *Beiträge* 254, 258, *K sintaksisu*; Magner 535; Kout 21; Deribas 24; Restan 77–80.

[7] Cf. Tomson, *Vin. p.* 684–85, *Beiträge* 254, *K sintaksisu*; Večerka 189; Kout 20; Uglitsky 384; Deribas 24; Restan 81–83.

Inversion

Several linguists assert that accusative frequency increases when the object is placed before the negated predicate.[8] In our material this increase is surprisingly insignificant. Acc. frequency for clauses with such an inverted word order is *35,2 per cent* (157 out of 446) as against 29,9 per cent for clauses with normal word order (500 out of 1673). However, by marked inversion, i.e. when the object is placed in the very beginning of the clause, acc. frequency increases to 40.5 per cent.

Lačugu s tex por bylo uže ne uznat' (Paust. *Zol.roza* 7),
Germanii ots'uda ne vidat' (Kat. *Syn polka* 123).

Polinu Nikolajevnu na mitinge ne vidala? (Kat. *Otčij dom* 401),
Griški ona počti ne videla (Šol. *Tich. Don* 71).

Ničto čelovek tak gluboko ne pr'ačet, kak mečtu (Paust. *Zol.roza* 196),
Čexla snimat' ne budem (Leon. *Obyk. čel.* 499).

Double Negation

Uglitsky and Deribas point out that the acc. tendency augments in clauses with a double negative, i.e. in clauses where both the first and the second part of the composed predicate are negated.[9] The result of our research, however, seems rather to indicate the opposite, that the acc. frequency diminishes. Thus acc. frequency in our selection is *22,2 per cent* (6 acc., 21 gen.).

U narodov ne mogut ne vyzyvat' takže ser'joznuju *trevogu* plany ispol'zovat' ...(*Izv.* 7.4.59),
...ne možet ne vyzyvat' *trevogi i ozabočennosti* (*Izv.* 30.1.59).

Nel'z'a ne otmetit' tu *točnost' i akkuratnost'*, s kakoj... (*Izv.* 18.7.18),
Nel'z'a ne otmetit' gluboko *realističeskix panno* xudožnika Puxova (Erenb. *Ottepel'* 80).

Negative Clauses with a Predicative Instrumental

Deribas and Dobromyslov point out that the accusative is used almost exclusively in negative clauses with a predicative instrumental, i.e. in clauses of the following type: *ne sčitaju ošibku gruboj.*[10] This is on the whole in

[8] Peškovskij 297; Kout 19–20; Magner 535–36; Uglitsky 383; *Gramm. russk. jaz.* II, 1, 562; Restan 91–98.

[9] Cf. Uglitsky 385; Deribas 23–24; Restan 99–101.

[10] Cf. Deribas 24; Dobromyslov 217–19; Restan 102–04.

accordance with the conclusion we have arrived at. In our collection we have only one example of the gen. as against 11 examples of the acc.

Llojd-Džordž...ne sčital *Rossiju* opasnym sopernikom (*Izv.* 10.5.23),
...literaturnyj *uroven'* mnogix gazet i žurnalov nel'z'a priznat' udovletvoritel'nym (*Izv.* 31.1.59, Suslov).

Poetomu, mne kažets'a, nel'z'a priznat' posledovatel'nym sledujuščego *opredelenija* vinitel'nogo s neopredel'onnym... (Potebnja, *Iz zapisok*... I–II, Moskva 1958, p. 300).

Gerunds and Participles

Uglitsky and Magner state that the accusative is seldom found in constructions with negated gerunds and participles.[11] We have made the same observation. Accusative frequency in our material is *12 per cent* (24 acc., 176 gen.).
...ne raskryvaja *paraš'uta* (Kat. *Doroga cvetov* 268),
...tovary, ne naxod'aščije *sbyta* na vnutrennem rynke (*Izv.* 28.1.59, Xruščov),

...ne sčitaja *čuguna* (*Izv.* 6.1.18).
...ne sčitaja *kvartiru i prodovol'stvije* (*Izv.* 6.1.18),

Mazepa, ne ponižaja *golos*, zagovoril po-latyni (Tolst. *P'otr I* 55),
...čast' vzrozlyx, ne uvažajuščix *zakony* socialističeskogo obščežitija (*Izv.* 18.4.59).

Verba sentiendi

Many linguists point out that the accusative is seldom found in constructions with negated sense verbs (in Old Russian the proper *verba sentiendi* governed the gen. also in positive clauses).[12] The result of our research agrees with this observation. In our selection acc. frequency with negated *verba sentiendi* is *19,8 per cent* (57 acc., 231 gen.) as against 32,8 per cent with other negated verbs (600 acc., 1231 gen.).

Ja poprežnemu ne vižu *zemli* (Sim. *Russ. vopros* 278),
Lučše bylo ne videt' seb'a – etu neukl'užuju *obrazinu*, kovyl'avšuju na revmatičeskix nogax (Paust. *Zol. roza* 13).

[11] Cf. Uglitsky 387; Magner 540; Restan 105–08.

[12] Cf. *Gramm. russk. jaz.* II, 1, 562; Dobromyslov 217–19; Deribas 23; Kout 14–16; Sobinnikova 118; Restan 109–16.

Vy, očevidno, ne zametili etoj malen'koj, no suščestvennoj *raznicy* (Sim. *Russk. vopros* 261),
Glaza oficera Van'a zametit' ne uspel (Kat. *Syn polka* 84).

...vy ne znajete *duši* russkogo reb'onka (Kat. *Syn polka* 80),
Rab možet ne znat' *jazyk* gospodina, ab[illegible] gospodin ob'azan znat' jazyk raba (Leon. *Našestvije* 488).

...*vygody* svojej ne ponimajete (Leon. *Našestvije* 489),
Poskol'ku daže ne ponimajet *bukvy* (Zošč. *Rasskazy* 52).

Nomera ne pomn'u (Leon. *Našestvije* 481),
Teper' eti bezžiznennyje *sxemy* uže nikto bol'še ne vspominajet (*Izv.* 5.4.59).

Ne imet'

The genitive claims to be the rule with *ne imet'*, and our investigation seems to affirm this observation.[13] In our selection accusative frequency constitutes only *2,6 per cent* (4 acc., 151 gen.).
Derevn'a *literatury* ne imejet i imet' ne budet, poka... (*Izv.* 24.3.20),
Nastojaščej *revol'ucii* v cerkvi my poka ješčo ne imejem (*Izv.* 11.5.23).

...ix pozicija...ne imejet rešajuščee *značenije* dl'a bezopasnosti SŠA (*Izv.* 1.4.59).

Intensive Negation

Many linguists have pointed out that the genitive is the rule when the negation is stressed.[14] This is in accordance with the results of our investigation, which embraces clauses where the negation is intensified by *nikakoj*, *ni* or *i*. Accusative frequency is *4 per cent* (9 acc., 216 gen.). With *nikakoj*, however, we have found no exceptions to the gen. rule.

Nikakoj dopolnitel'noj *platy* ... naselenije derevni vzimat' prava ne imejet (*Izv.* 5.6.23).

On vdrug zabyls'a... ne videl ni *Marii Il'jinišny*, ni kol'učej buro-seroj *pal'my*, ni *ščitov* s knigami (Erenb. *Ottepel'* 7–8),
No my ne budem zdes' privodit' ni statističeskij, ni meteorologičeskij *material*... (*Izv.* 10.5.23).

[13] Cf. Magner 537; Kout 448; Deribas 23; Sobinnikova 118; Restan 117–19.
[14] Cf. Dobromyslov 217–19; Zemskij 41ff; Ovs.-Kul. *Ruk.* 194; Restan 120–23.

Revizionistam ne udalos′ sbit′ s marksistsko-leninskogo puti ni odnoj bratskoj *partii* (*Izv.* 28.1.59 – Xruščov),
Devicu ni odnu mimo seb′a ne propuskal (Zošč. *Nervn. l′udi* 26).

– Nebos′, – govorit, – i *familii* ne možeš podpisyvat′ na bumage (Zošč. *Rasskazy* 26),
...neuči, ne umevšije inogda podpisat′ daže i sobstvennoje *im′a* (*Izv.* 20.7.18).

The Partitive genitivus negationis

It is natural for the accusative tendency almost never to assert itself when the direct object in a negative clause has a clear partitive character.[15] In our selection we have found only one example of the acc., otherwise exclusively the gen.

Nikogda ješčo ne pila *vina* (Leon. *Obyk. čel.* 553),
A *produktov* ne vezut (Sim. *Dni i noči* 195),
Vodki na stol ne stav′te (Leon. *Obyk čel.* 508).

...sledit′, čtob onyj pekar′ ne voroval *muku, jajca, maslo i vypečennyj tovar* (Gor′kij, *Moi univ.* 42).

Ne vidno, ne slyšno

The impersonal-predicative words *vidno, slyšno* etc. are verbal in their origin and have among other things preserved the ability to govern the genitive when they are negated (the accusative only exceptionally). In our material we have only one example of the acc. as against 16 ex. of the gen.[16]

...ne slyšno *šuma* (Kat. *Doroga cv.* 222),
...*pogonov* jego ne bylo vidno (Kat. *Syn polka* 91).

Zanaves′te okna, čtoby ne vidno bylo *svet* skvoz′ ščeli staven (Gor′kij, *Moi univ.* 57).

Pronouns[17]

ETO. Acc. freq.: *9 per cent* (8 acc., 77 gen.).
...*etogo* sdelat′ oni ne mogut (*Izv.* 18.7.18),
Eto nikogda ne učt′oš′ (Kat. *Syn polka* 38).

[15] Cf. Kout 446–47; Bogorodickij 211–25; Černyšov, *Pravil.* II, 20–21, Dobromyslov 217–19; Restan 124–26.
[16] Cf. Galkina-Fedoruk 285; Karcevskij 126; Černyšov, *Otricanije* 66; Restan 127–28.
[17] Cf. Restan 135–39; Uglitsky 386–87.

TO. Acc. freq.: *15 per cent* (4 acc., 23 gen.).
Ne podobajet čestnym revol'ucioneram obxodit' molčanijem *togo*, čto... (*Izv*. 17.7.18),
...ne otricajut oni i *to*, čto... (*Izv*. 18.7.18).
ČTO. Acc. freq.: *23 per cent* (7 acc., 24 gen.).
Drugoj graždanin pisat' znajet, a pročest', *čego* napisal – ne možet (Zošč. *Nervn. l'udi* 46),
...samoje glavnoje, *čto* ne vyraziš' nikakimi ciframi... (*Izv*. 10.1.59).
KOTORYJ. Acc. freq.: *52 per cent* (11 acc., 10 gen.).
[vnimanije], *kotorogo* ja ne zaslužil (Leon. *Obyk. čel.* 525),
...otvetil Saburov s toj spokojnoj logikoj, *kotoruju* v n'om osobenno ne l'ubil večno spešivšij Babčenko (Sim. *Dni i noči* 10).

Abstract Neuter Adjectives Used Substantively[18]

Accusative frequency: *13 per cent* (3 acc., 21 gen.).
Poslednego nel'z'a skazat' pro bol'šinstvo ispolnitelej (*Izv*. 11.5.23),
...protiv lic, ne ispoln'ajuščix *vyšeizložennoje* (*Izv*.).

SUMMARY

Accusative Frequency

ne vidno, ne slyšno	almost no acc. frequency		
ne imet'	3 per cent	acc. freq.	
intensive negation	4	—	—
eto	9	—	—
gerunds and participles	12	—	—
abstract neuter adjectives	13	—	—
to	15	—	—
verba sentiendi	20	—	—
double negation	22	—	—
čto	23	—	—
plural nouns	30	—	—
average freguency	*31*	—	—
inverted word order	35	—	—
the perfective aspect	40	—	—
a-stems	48	—	—
kotoryj	52	—	—
the imperative mood	54	—	—

[18] Cf. Restan 139; Uglitsky 386–87.

concrete, definite nouns	56	per cent	acc. freq.
indirect negation	60	—	—
interrogative clauses	70	—	—
proper nouns	77	—	—
neg. clauses with a pred. instr.	almost exclusively the acc.		

STYLISTIC ASPECTS

We have cited above a series of examples of accusative usage after transitive negative verbs or verbal expressions, and have tried to classify them according to certain criteria. The interesting thing is, however, that we have sometimes run across apparently "unmotivated" accusatives, i.e. the acc. in clauses where the formal and semantic criteria should strictly indicate the use of the genitive. Why, for instance, is the acc., and not the gen.' used in the following clauses:

Zanaves'te okna, čtoby ne vidno bylo *svet* skvoz' ščeli staven (Gor'kij, *Moi univ.* 57),

...ne imejet rešajuščee *značenije* (*Izv.* 1.4.59),

No my ne budem zdes' privodit' ni statističeskij, ni meteorologičeskij *material* (*Izv.* 10.5.23),

Ja ne mogu bol'še prinimat' *učastije* v etom pošlom meščanskom farse (Kat. *Kvadr. kruga* 104),

Mazepa, ne ponižaja *golos*,... (Tolst. *P'otr I* 55),

...protiv lic, ne ispoln'ajuščix *vyšeizložennoje* (*Izv.*).

And vice versa: Why do we find the genitive and not the accusative in the clauses below?:

Poetomu, mne kažets'a, nel'z'a priznat' posledovatel'nym sledujuščego *opredelenija* vinitel'nogo s neopredel'onnym... (Potebn'a, *Iz zapisok* ... I–II, Moskva 1958, 300). – The gen. in spite of the predicative instrumental in the same clause. Moreover, the negation is indirect (*nel'z'a* + an infinitive).

Prezidiuma vybirat' ne stanem? (Leon. *Našestvie* 524). – The gen. in spite of indirect negation. Moreover, the clause is interrogative, and the object occurs in the front of the predicate, even in the very beginning of the clause.

...nel'z'a bylo predstavit' sebe *Nevy* bez barž s drovami, a *Moskvy* – bez ešelonov s dorogim doneckim ugl'om (*Izv.* 1.1.59). – The gen. in spite of the following factors: The negation is indirect, the predicate is perfective, the objects are concrete, definite nouns, even proper nouns belonging to the *a*-stems.

Černil ne oprokin'te (Leon. *Našestvije* 480). – The gen. in spite of marked inversion, concrete and definite object, perfective predicate, imperative mood.

And why does Gor'kij write *ne snimaja furažku* (*Moi univ.* 115) when Šoloxov writes *ne skinuv furažki* (*Tix. Don* 63)? etc., etc.

It hardly seems logical that mere accident should decide the choice of case in these examples. It is, I think, more probable to assume that stylistic motives have, to a certain degree, a finger in the pie, as stylistic factors always play a role where there is room for selection.

Going back to Church Slavonic we find that accusative frequency in negative clauses is not the same in the various manuscripts. On the basis of Radoslav Večerka's investigation (see Bibliography) we have calculated that acc. frequency in the *Codex Marianus* and the *Codex Assemanius* constitutes only 5 per cent, whereas in the *Codex Supraliensis* it constitutes 16 per cent and in the *Glagolita Clozianus* as much as 24 per cent.

If we make a parallel analysis of the Russian belles-lettres we have chosen for our work, we find the following interesting figures:

Narrative Prose

Šoloxov	38	examples,	11	per cent being in the acc.
Erenburg	57	—	18	—
Katajev	96	—	18	—
Gor'kij	50	—	24	—
Simonov	121	—	25	—
A. Tolstoj	20	—	25	—
Zoščenko	71	—	31	—
Paustovskij	135	—	48	—
Total..	588	examples,	28,1	per cent being in the acc.

Dialogue

Erenburg	68	examples	21	per cent being in the acc.
A. Tolstoj	28	—	29	—
L. Leonov	87	—	30	—
Simonov	86	—	33	—
Katajev	112	—	36	—
Kornejčuk	25	—	40	—
Paustovskij	29	—	48	—
Zoščenko	49	—	53	—
Gor'kij	24	—	63	—
Šoloxov	12	—	67	—
Total..	520	examples,	36,4	per cent being in the acc.

What conclusions can we draw from these figures?

First, that in Russian there is a *marked difference in accusative frequency between narrative prose and dialogue.*

Secondly, that there is, in part, a *marked difference in accusative frequency in the various authors.*

The Styles of Narrative Prose and Dialogue

The fact that the accusative after negative transitive verbs occurs more frequently in spoken than in written language has earlier been pointed out by Tomson, Kout, Gvozd'ov, Deribas and Magner among others. Moreover, Šaxmatov and Sobinnikova state that the acc. usage in such constructions is particularly frequent in Russian dialects. The figures above show that a high acc. frequency is more or less the case also in literary dialogue.[19]

Admitting this we should, however, be aware of another fact – that the increased accusative tendency in dialogue compared with narrative prose is often only an indirect result of the use of colloquial style, the direct reason being the structure or the form of the clauses. Thus imperative clauses are far more common in dialogue than in narrative prose (in our material 39 examples from dialogue, none from narrative prose). This is also the case in interrogative clauses (in our selection 31 ex. from dialogue, 2 from narrative prose). On the other hand gerundial constructions – to a lesser extent participial constructions – are typical for narrative prose and are relatively infrequent in dialogue (in our material 106 examples from narrative prose, 3 from dialogue).

The Individual Authors

Owing to the limited material examined it is obvious that we can only express ourselves with the utmost caution on the attitude of the various authors to the question of negated acc. versus negated gen. There would, however, seem to be every indication that we are here dealing with significant individual variations. By more closely examining the above figures we find, among other things, the following peculiarities:

1) Šoloxov and Gor'kij seem to distinguish most sharply between the styles of dialogue and narrative prose (acc. frequency considerably above average for dialogue, considerably below average for narrative prose).

2) Erenburg and Simonov seem to be very cautious in the use of the negated acc. (below average for both styles).

[19] Cf. Tomson, *Vin. p.* 675, *Beiträge* 253, *K sintaksisu*; Kout 442; Gvozd'ov 154; Deribas 24; Magner 533; Sobinnikova; Šaxmatov I 325; Restan 143–47.

3) Paustovskij and Zoščenko seem to display a marked predilection for the negated acc. (above average for both categories).

In this connection we recall Tomson's observation (*Beiträge* 253):

"Unter dem Einfluss der Grammatik, die den Genetiv beim negierten Verbum vorschreibt, suchen allerdings Gebildete, besonders wenn sie sich mit Bewusstheit zur Sache verhalten, wie Schreibende oder Lehrer beim Korrigieren, den Akkusativ zu vermeiden. Aber das gelingt nicht immer, und solche Akkusative finden sich überall, besonders bei Schriftstellern, die die Volkssprache gut beherrschen."

The assertion that Russian authors, at least some of them, had (and still have?) a tendency to "weed" their language of the accusative in negative clauses cannot, in our opinion, be flatly rejected. According to Uglitsky (pp. 377–78) it has been calculated "that in *Crime and Punishment* the accusative is used in some 25 per cent and the genitive in 75 per cent of the cases where the transitive verb is preceded by the negative particle. In Turgenev's novel *A Nest of Gentlefolk* the ratio is 13,8 per cent for the accusative to 86,2 per cent for the genitive, and in Ostrovskij's *The Thunderstorm* it is 10,7 per cent for the accusative to 89,3 per cent for the genitive."

When taken into account that Dostojevskij had seldom time and opportunity to file and polish the language of his books it *may* imply that Tomson's postulate is right in the main.

The Newspaper Language

Uglitsky (p. 378) writes that the tendency to use the accusative after negated verbs strongly asserts itself in "scientific and publicistic (sic!) writing of our time. In newspapers however the use of the accusative with negative verbs is exceptional."

Kout (p. 22) maintains exactly the opposite: "In the style of publicists and journalists the accusative is rather frequent." On the other hand, extensive use of *genitivus negationis* is "characteristic of book-language, particularly scientific style."

As to newspaper language our disscrtation relies on a relatively comprehensive collection of examples, and moreover, we have the advantage of being able to evaluate it so to say in a "historical" perspective (our selections covering two periods with more than a generation in between). We have arrived at the following conclusions:

To-day (1959) the negated accusative in newspaper language constitutes as much as 38,3 per cent according to our material, whereas the frequency forty years ago (1918–23) was only 21,7 per cent.

What underlies this rapid development? Has it taken place consciously or unconsciously? Has it been prepared over a long period? Will it continue? Is there a parallel development in belles-lettres?

We are unfortunately not able to give a definite answer to any of these questions. So far, we must limit ourselves to assumptions and mere guesses. Is it conceivable that this development is in some way connected with the abolishment of illiteracy? If it is true that the negated accusative is most wide-spread in the popular language, isn't it then possible to assume that this linguistic peculiarity would follow the young workers and peasants into their new professions, for instance as journalists and reporters? – and that this peculiarity has gradually gained a certain tradition in newspaper language ever since? For the moment we are not able to find a more plausible explanation.

As to scientific style we have not undertaken any specific studies. However, we do not unconditionally agree with the sharp demarkation that both Uglitsky and Kout seem to draw between the style of newspaper articles and the style of scientific papers. Our examination of newspaper language covers to a great extent also scientific topics (including popular scientific writing): articles on economics, law, agriculture, medicine, nuclear research, history, literature, political science etc. written by professors and other scientific workers. So, the increasing accusative tendency is in our opinion typical of scientific (including popular scientific) style as well, and for the present it seems to us questionable whether Uglitsky's and Kout's conclusions on this point are in accordance with reality – apart from the fact that they each have arrived at exactly opposite results in their research. However, we want to emphasize that we, on the basis of our material, are not able to take a definite stand on Kout's assertion, as our research does not include Science Academy publications or any scientific *books*.

Belles-lettres and Newspaper Language
A Comparison

It is interesting to pay attention to the distribution of the negated accusative and the negated genitive within our four categories:

	Acc. frequency
The *Izvestija* 1918–23	21,7 per cent (110 acc., 397 gen.)
Narrative prose	28,1 per cent (165 acc., 423 gen.)
Dialogue	36,4 per cent (189 acc., 331 gen.)
The *Izvestija* 1959	38,3 per cent (193 acc., 311 gen.)

The most peculiar feature is the following: *While newspaper language in 1918–23 was that category showing the lowest accusative frequency in negative clauses, it has in the course of forty years overtaken and passed the categories of narrative prose and dialogue.*

We have mentioned that stylistic factors may determine the alternative of the negated genitive and the negated accusative. In *belles-lettres* these factors express themselves in the language of the various authors. In *newspaper language* we saw an increasing tendency to limit the use of *genitivus negationis*, in other words a tendency that is determined by time factors. It is, however, possible that also other factors are contributive (sociological factors? milieu factors?).

Moreover it is probable, although we are not able to prove it, that stylistic factors play a role in newspaper language as well, even if presumably to a lesser extent than in belles-lettres. On the other hand we assume that time factors (including sociological and milieu factors) play a role also in belles-lettres, even though it is impossible to prove it on the basis of the material we have examined (but could in all probability be confirmed by an examination of the belles-lettres from a period covering, say, a hundred years).

Formal Stylistic Demands

Thomas Magner (p. 539) tells about an interesting inquiry he conducted among Russian emigrés in the USA. He asked them to translate into English the following clauses:

Ty bumagi ne prin'os?

On pesni ne pojot.

Seven of them rendered *bumagi* by papers and *pesni* by songs. Only five pointed out that *bumagi* and *pesni* might be either the singular or the plural, according to the context.

It is obvious that a good stylist to the best of his ability strives to avoid such homonymous forms. One should, naturally, write not only to be understood, but also not to be misunderstood. However, even a writer like Šoloxov may sometimes sin against this rule, for instance in *Tixij Don*, page 26: *On...dolgo ne snimal ruki s jejo pleča.* Only later does it turn out that it is "hand" and not "hands" Šoloxov is speaking about.

MAIN CONCLUSION

Usage shows that *genitivus negationis* still holds its position in written literary Russian as the strongest objective case in negative clauses (the gen.: 69 per cent; the acc.: 31 per cent). However, the accusative is making progress –

undoubtedly in newspaper language and probably in belles-lettres – and is to-day the strongest case provided that one or more of the following factors are present:

1) When the object occurs in connection with a predicative instrumental (almost exclusively the acc.),
2) When the object is a proper noun (the acc.: 77 per cent),
3) Object in a negative interrogative clause (the acc.: 70 per cent),
4) When the object is indirectly governed by a negated verb or verbal expression (the acc.: 60 per cent),
5) When the object is concrete and definite (the acc.: 56 per cent),
6) Object in a negative imperative clause (the acc.: 54 per cent).

Closing Remark

The "genitive terror" (Kout's expression) at the time of Lomonosov is to-day replaced by a marked liberalism which, by the way, is sanctioned by the Science Academy grammar (*Grammatika russkogo jazyka*, see Bibliography and quotation page 97). Between these extremes there are a series of partly diverging statements that on the whole seem to approve the *genitivus negationis* "rule", admitting however that exceptions are "usual", "frequent", "not infrequent" etc.

In our investigation we have tried to find more adequate formulations to replace the above-mentioned adjectives, and have found it necessary to resort to figures and statistics. It stands to reason that the figures, due to the relatively modest extent of our material, have only a limited value; our aim has been to give a description of the *tendency* prevailing in the development of the linguistic problem concerned, and to explain the mutual relationships between the different factors.

Among the various problems that we have not had the opportunity of discussing is above all the question of the role of *vocal emphasis* in negative clauses. Tomson *(Vin. pad.)* however gives a lot of interesting examples where vocal stress may exclude use of *genitivus negationis* (the emphasized words are underlined):

Ja ne vz'al Vaš zontik,
Ne *vz'al* ja Vaš zontik,
Ne beri *zontik* (beri palku),
Ja ne *polučil* knigu (ja kupil jejo),
Ne vybiraj *nevěstu*, vybiraj svaxu.
A vozik svoj my ne *svez'om*, a skatim [Krylov].

The verb *l'ubit'* might also deserve a special study. For instance, "I do

not like soup" is in Russian *Ja ne ljublju sup*. The genitive *supa* is here impossible. However, if one adds a qualifying adjective, the genitive, too, might be used, although most Russians would probably prefer the accusative:

Gor'ačij (moločnyj) sup ne l'ubl'u,
Gor'ačego (moločnogo) supa ne l'ub'ju.

Finally, a thorough examination of the language of different authors (Paustovskij? Gor'kij? Šoloxov?) would certainly give exceedingly interesting results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

RFV = *Russkij filologičeskij vestnik*
RJVŠ = *Russkij jazyk v škole*
IF = *Indogermanische Forschungen*

Bogorodickij, V., *Sintaksis roditel'nago padeža v russkom jazykě*, RFV 68, 1912, 211–25.

Černyšov, V., *Otricanije "ne" v russkom jazyke*, izd. 2, Leningrad 1927, 27–28, 61–64, 65, 66–67, 78–81. Abbreviated: *Otric.*

Černyšov, V., *Pravil'nost' i čistota russkoj rěči*, Spb. 1914–15, II, 20–21. Abbreviated: *Pravil.*

Deribas, L. A., *Pr'amoje dopolnenije pri perexodnom glagole s otricanijem*, RJVŠ 1956, 2, 21–25.

Dobromyslov i Rozental', *Trudnyje voprosy grammatiki i pravopisanija*, izd. 2, Moskva 1958, 217–19. (Same article in RJVŠ 1952, 1, 90–91).

Ekblom, R., *Rysk grammatik*, 6., omarb. uppl., Sth. 1954, 142.

Galkina-Fedoruk, E. M., *Bezličnyje predloženija v sovremennom russkom jazyke*, Moskva 1958, 64, 243–45, 285, 296–300.

Grammatika russkogo jazyka, Akademija Nauk SSSR, Moskva 1953–54, II, 1, 562–63.

Gvozd'ov, A. N., *Očerki po stilistike russkogo jazyka*, Moskva 1955, 154–55.

Karcevski, Serge, *Système du verbe russe*, Prague 1927, 99–100, 117, 126, 127–28.

Kout, J., *Genitiv záporový v ruštině a češtině*, *Ruský jazyk* 6, 1956, 440–50; 7, 1957, 13–24. (Same article in RJVŠ 1960, 2).

Magner, Thomas F., *Negation and Case Selection in Russian*, *Word* 11, 1955, 531–41.

Marnitz, L. v., *Russische Grammatik*, 11. Auflage, Halle (Saale) 1950, 157–58.

Ovs'aniko-Kulikovskij, D. N., *Rukovodstvo k izučeniju sintaksisa*, Moskva 1909, 193–95. Abbreviated: *Ruk.*

Ovs'aniko-Kulikovskij, D. N., *Učebnik russkoj grammatiki*, Spb. 1912, 100–102. Abbreviated: *Učebnik.*

Paffen, K. A., *Die Hauptregeln der russischen Grammatik*, Bd. 2, *Satzlehre*, Halle (Saale) 1954, 101–104.

Pedersen, Holger, *Russisk Grammatik*, Kbh. 1916, 124–26.

Peškovskij, A. M., *Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščenii*, Moskva 1956, 296–97, 357, 366–67, 303.

Potebn'a, A. A., *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike*, I–II, Moskva 1958, 319–21, 489–90.
Restan, Per A., *Konkurransen mellom nektet genitiv og nektet akkusativ i moderne russisk (1918–59)*, 169 pages, illustrated, dissertation 1959, available at the University Library, Oslo.
Šaxmatov, A. A., *Sintaksis russkogo jazyka*, Leningrad 1925–27, I, 120, 126–27, 319–20, 324–25; II, 156.
Šapiro, A. B., *Očerki po sintaksisu russkix narodnyx govorov*, Moskva 1953, 195–99.
Sobinnikova, V. I., *Roditel'nyj i vinitel'nyj padeži pr'amogo objekta pri otricanii v narodnyx govorax*, *Trudy Voronežskogo gosud. universiteta*, 38, Xar'kov 1955 (I know her paper only from Kout and Večerka);
Thomson, A. I., *Beiträge zur Kasuslehre. III. Zur Genetivrektion des Verbums im Baltischslavischen*, *IF*, XXIX, 1911–12, 249–259. Abbreviated: *Beiträge*.
Tomson, A. I., *K sintaksisu i semasiologii russkago jazyka*, *Letopis' Istoriko-filol. obščestva pri Imper. Novoross. Universitetě*, X, 1902, 281–364. (Special issue Odessa 1903). Abbreviated: *K sintaksisu*;
Tomson, A. I., *Vinitel'nyj padež pr'amogo dopolnenija v otricatel'nyx predloženijax v russkom jazykě*, *RFV*, 49, 1903, 192–234. (Same article in *Sbornik statej ... F. F. Fortunatovu*, Varšava 1902, 660–702). Abbreviated: *Vin. p.*
Uglitsky, Z., *Accusative and Genitive with Transitive Verbs Preceded by a Negative in Contemporary Russian*, *The Slavonic Review* 34, 1955–56, 377–87.
Večerka, R., *Střídání záporového genitivu se záporovým akusativem v staroslověnštině*, *Studie ze slovanské jazykovědy*, Praha 1958, 185–200.
Zemskij, Kr'učkov, Svetlajev, *Russkij jazyk* II, Moskva 1955, 41 ff.

Finally, I make use of this opportunity to draw attention to a thesis by D. I. Butorin: *Vinitel'nyj i roditel'nyj padeži pr'amogo objekta v russkom literaturnom jazyke XIX–XX vv.*, Leningrad, Pedag. institut 1953, 20 pp. (Résumé d'une thèse). Unfortunately, it has not been available here. Nor is it mentioned by linguists who have recently dealt with the same subject: Magner, Uglitsky, Deribas, Kout and Večerka.